



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for September 1974

REPLY TO THE RADICALS

Patrick Wall M.P.

THE REAL SUBVERTERS

The Editor

ECUMENISM: TWO VIEWS

*Canon Richard L. Stewart
Michael Davies*

CHILE: HOW MUCH
DID THE SOVIET KNOW?

Czeslaw Jesman

G. K. CHESTERTON

Charles Gorman

PRO FIDE MEETING
CAXTON HALL, WESTMINSTER
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15th

7.45 p.m.

Father Paul Crane, S.J.
(Editor of *Christian Order*)

will speak on

"THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD"

Chairman

Patrick Wall, M.P. (Chairman of Pro Fide).

All welcome and all enquiries to the Hon. Sec., E. W. Wade, MBE, 39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey.

THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY

HIGH MASS

(Latin Traditional Rite)

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6th

at 3 p.m.

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST CHURCH

ST. GILES GATE, NORWICH

Sermon by Father Paul Crane, S.J.

(Editor of *Christian Order*)

Contents

Page	
514	A HOPE AND A PRAYER <i>The Editor</i>
515	G. K. CHESTERTON, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH <i>Charles Gorman</i>
518	REPLY TO THE RADICALS <i>Patrick Wall, M.P.</i>
527	READINGS AT MASS <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
530	ECUMENISM: TWO VIEWS. 1: ECUMINIMALISM?? <i>V. Rev. Canon Richard L. Steward</i>
537	2: "LET THEM RETURN TO THEIR FATHERS" <i>Michael Davies</i>
555	CHILE: HOW MUCH DID THE SOVIET KNOW? <i>Czeslaw Jesman</i>
571	ANY QUESTIONS? <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 15

SEPTEMBER, 1974

NUMBER 9

A Hope and a Prayer

THE EDITOR

WHAT we hope for so much from the forthcoming Synod and ask with the greatest respect of its participants is that they should see it essentially as a time for reflection and prayer. Reflection on the state of the Catholic Church some nine years after the close of the Second Vatican Council; prayer that the Holy Spirit may guide them and give them strength and courage to set the Church once more on the path mapped out for it by Christ Our Lord; that they may see that task primarily as one of extending through time the work of His Redemption, as, in essence, spiritual; that the confusion which has sent so many in hot pursuit of the kingdom of man, as a prime objective of Catholic endeavour, may cease; that the Church we love may once more consecrate herself, as of first and abiding necessity, to the full glory of her supernatural mission without compromise, without fear or favour, faithful always to her God-given task of upholding God's truth.

We ask for no more than this. We ask it with love and with filial piety. Are we wrong to ask it? I think not, for that, after all, is what Christ asked of His Church. It must be the prayer of us all that the Holy Father and his Bishops at the Synod will proceed to do what we ask.

G. K. Chesterton

Defender of the Faith

CHARLES GORMAN

ALL English Catholics who are middle-aged or older will remember with special affection and pride this year a great man whose like we shall never see again. Indeed, Chesterton was so much read and respected at the time of his death by non-Catholic Englishmen and non-English Catholics that it seems quite incredible that his books are now almost impossible to obtain.

When Gilbert Chesterton died in 1936 Pope Pius XI sent his sympathy to all the English people in their loss of this "Defender of the Faith". This was a unique honour, bestowed by only one previous Pope, and that also to an Englishman—King Henry VIII. Ironically, it is almost certain that the original title was really earned by St. Thomas More, the King merely taking the credit. Chesterton seems to have had many things in common with More—great faith, a profound mind, courage and integrity, genius with tongue and pen, yet with all these things a childlike simplicity and love of life.

What can one say of such a man in a single article? He was first and foremost a Fleet Street journalist. He produced a prodigious crop of essays and articles. He was poet, debater, philosopher, theologian, critic, broadcaster, novelist. To my mind fiction was not really his line, although his Father Brown Stories are immortal. I think, however, that their appeal lies in their quite original approach to the solving of crime mysteries, by the priest-detective putting on, as it were, the soul of the criminal. He loved to laugh at himself and his own absent-mindedness, as when he recounts sending a telegram to his wife: "Am in Market Harborough. Where should I be?"

It seems strange now, after the years that he has been

largely neglected, to remember that when I was at school (a non-Catholic school) during the last few years of his life, he was the most-read man in English literature after Shakespeare and Dickens. If we re-read his essays now, not to mention his most profound works such as *Orthodoxy* and *The Everlasting Man*, one thing must surely strike us. He is immensely *readable* even when most profound. If one may say so with all reverence, his sayings have a likeness to those of his Master, Christ. He enlightens and instructs the wise but can still be read by the simple. A rare quality, indeed.

What if he were with us to-day, in these days of considerable diversity of thought within the Catholic fold? Firstly, he can teach us Charity. Of Bernard Shaw he said "Everything about him is wrong except himself". And H. G. Wells said of Chesterton "I don't believe in his God. But when I die I might be proved wrong. Then I would say — be lenient with me, I was a friend of Gilbert Chesterton".

But it is not only charity that he can teach us to-day. He has written much that is immensely relevant to our current problems.

On changing fashions: "The Catholic Church is the only thing that can save a man from the degrading slavery of being a child of his age".

On the Papacy: "It is not the people who would be the heirs of a dethroned Pope. It is some synod of bishops; a group small enough to be insolent and large enough to be irresponsible".

On the Magisterium: "We don't want a religion that is right where we are right. We want a religion that is right where we are wrong".

On obsessive Ecumenism: "The whole world once very nearly died of broadmindedness and the brotherhood of all religions. It was the refusal of the early Christians to agree to have Jesus Christ included with all the Roman gods which was the turning point of history".

It is interesting to compare similar prophecies by

Chesterton the believer and Wells the atheist. Chesterton said that the great heresy of the twentieth century would be one concerning sexual morality. Wells said that Christianity would eventually be destroyed by contraception.

A number of books and articles have been written about G. K. C. since he died, and naturally there is quite a crop of them this year. It must be pointed out that not everything in a biography is likely to be wholly accurate, especially if the writer is not in possession of all the facts. For instance, Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, in her book *The Chestertons* made the startling assertion that Gilbert and Frances Chesterton never consummated their marriage. The general reaction by readers was that the information was in bad taste and need not have been given. However, Maisie Ward in her excellent biography refutes that theory utterly by telling us that the couple were so disappointed at not having a child that Frances had an operation—which was still to no avail.

It is being said now that Shaw was a much better friend to Chesterton than was Belloc. It seems to me that the only people who could really know would be the three men themselves. I can only remark that the person I may regard as my best friend may not necessarily regard me as his (or her) best friend. At any rate it is quite clear that Chesterton looked on Belloc as his best friend. Whether that feeling was entirely reciprocated is another matter.

What of Chesterton's future influence? I venture to predict that not only will there be a revival of interest in his works—especially *Orthodoxy* and *The Everlasting Man*—but that he will increasingly gain recognition as one of the very greatest men of our times. He has brought many thousands of people to believe in Christ and His Church. I am convinced that his influence will continue for centuries.

This article was written by way of reply to an editorial in the *Catholic Gazette* for December, 1973. The Editor of that Review saw fit to turn it down. The Editor of *Christian Order* is most happy to publish it, not only because of his admiration for the Pro Fide Movement; but because of the appositeness of the comments made by the Chairman of Pro Fide in this extremely relevant piece of writing.

Reply to the Radicals

PATRICK WALL, M.P.

THE editorial of the December 1973 issue of the *Catholic Gazette* contained the following statement:

"There are some in the Church who not only do not enjoy peace but seem intent on undermining the peace which others have managed to acquire in the Church to-day. How many times in this past year have we been treated to the fine spectacle of certain extremists openly sowing the seeds of discontent by setting themselves up as the only judges of orthodoxy? Peace and good will is not one of their main contributions to the life of the Church in this country. The truth has not yet been understood that it is as easy to fall into error through defect as through excess".

Unsubstantiated Generalizations

Similar statements have appeared in a number of Catholic papers, almost invariably sharing three characteristics in common with the one quoted—no attempt is made to identify these groups, no attempt is made to define extremism, and no attempt is made to provide examples of the erroneous concept of orthodoxy which it is alleged they

hold. Thus, in the November (1973) issue of the *Catholic Gazette*, Fr. Michael Hollings writes:

"Unfortunately, because the climate which has followed Vatican II has been a climate in this country which has the autumnal bite of episcopal reticence, the 'whole-hoggers' who want to go ahead with the implementation of Vatican II get featured as 'dangerous men'. There is a whiff of heresy about when very ordinary implementations are urged; there is doubt as to orthodoxy when any question is raised which might eventually undermine the established *status quo* at any and all levels of Church life. Sadly enough, there are those about to-day who lead witch hunts to expose 'dangerous trends', using all their energy negatively. This is doubly sad, because it is so easy to induce fear and bewilderment, so hard to create a spirit of courage, hope and vision."

In this passage Fr. Hollings not only fails to clarify the three points already mentioned but adds another—that those who wish to implement Vatican II are attacked for doing so. Needless to say, he does not specify any instances of this happening.

The type of irresponsible and unsubstantiated generalisations contained in these two quotations are only too common in the world of politics. Even so, they are deplorable; but when found in Catholic publications they are quite inexcusable. It is, of course, a matter of regret that Catholics should find it necessary to criticise fellow members of the Church; but this is no new phenomenon. Where Catholics feel bound to disagree, this should be in a spirit of charity and truth; whenever one of these elements is missing it makes it difficult to accept that the individual or group putting forward the arguments is imbued with a truly Christian spirit.

Catholics and the Defence of Orthodoxy

I happen to be the Chairman of the Pro Fide Movement, an Organisation which has been set up to defend

orthodoxy; though in no way claiming to be the judge, let alone one of "the only judges" of orthodoxy. We have, to quote Fr. Hollings, taken it upon ourselves to expose "dangerous trends" without in any way considering ourselves to be leading "witch hunts". Fr. Hollings clearly considers himself to be bringing to the attention of readers of the *Catholic Gazette* what he thinks of as a dangerous trend, a right which we would not deny him for one moment; but, it would be most interesting if he would explain why, for him to warn Catholics against a trend of which he disapproves is laudable, whilst for anyone else to complain of trends which meet with his approval is to indulge in "a witch hunt"! This technique has been used against the Pro Fide Movement, and against me personally, on a number of occasions without a shred of evidence to support it. Yet, far from being deplorable, a concern to defend orthodoxy should characterise every confirmed Catholic. Since Vatican II, the *Catholic Gazette's* Question Box feature has contained numerous admirable defences of orthodox teaching which have come under attack from within the Church, ranging from the existence of Satan to the intrinsic sinfulness of contraception. No-one with even a cursory knowledge of events within the Church to-day could deny that there are "dangerous trends" there — dangerous to the faith of the ordinary Catholic and dangerous to the future of the Church in the advanced western countries. As we should expect, the lead in exposing and condemning these dangerous trends has been taken by the Holy Father himself.

In March 1970, the late Cardinal Danielou, one of the most eminent theologians and patristic scholars, wrote: "Today one cannot but wonder if this post-Conciliar period, which might have been a magnificent period in the encounter of the Christian Faith with the modern world, does not risk, on the contrary, being a time of surrender in which the faith and life of the Church will disintegrate". His equally celebrated Jesuit confrère, Henri de Lubac, foresaw this crisis in 1967: "It is clear that the

Church is facing a grave crisis. Under the name of 'the new Church', 'the post-Conciliar Church', a Church different from that of Jesus Christ is trying to establish itself". Fr. de Lubac did not hesitate to term this "different Church" an "apostasy which is allowing itself to be swept along in a movement of general abdication under the pretext of renewal, ecumenism, adaptation". In endorsing such criticisms of the movement which is undermining the authority of the Church and vitiating the work of Vatican II, Pope Paul has used even stronger language. He continually makes use of such phrases as "spirit of criticism . . . indocility and rebellion . . . alteration of the idea of sin . . . despoiling the patrimony of the Church . . . ancient errors re-echoed . . . reducing the Church to a skeleton . . . laws and traditions questioned."

The Pope and Contemporary Errors

The Pope has been very specific concerning the errors which threaten the Church:

"There have been voices which attempt to distort fundamental doctrines clearly professed by the Church of God concerning, for instance, the Resurrection of Christ, the reality of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, the Virginity of Our Lady, and for that reason the august mystery of the Incarnation . . . What is frightening is not only the gravity of these false affirmations, but the irreverent and foolhardy audacity with which they are made. This gives us the impression that the criterion is gaining ground here and there of judging the truths of the Faith as the individual thinks best, and according to his capacity for understanding and his own preference of phraseology in the theological and religious fields." (See *Catholic Truth*, Autumn 1968).

Later, in May 1970, the Pope made a very detailed analysis of the crisis of truth within the Church:

"Christian truth is undergoing fearful shocks and crises", he maintained, because many within the Church "will not accept the teaching of the *Magisterium* which Christ set up

as a safeguard and for the logical development of his doctrine, which is God's own teaching. There are some who try to make the Faith easy by emptying it, the whole, the true Faith, of those truths which appear to be unacceptable to the modern mind. They follow their own tastes, to choose a truth which is considered to be acceptable. Others are looking for a new faith, especially a new belief about the Church. They are trying to bring her into line with the ideas of modern sociology and secular history. In this they are repeating errors of other times . . . Others again would like to put their trust in a purely naturalistic and philanthropic belief . . . a cult of man, and neglect the prime value, which is love and worship of God.

"Still others show a certain distrust for the Faith's dogmatic demands, and take up the pretext of pluralism, which would enable them to study the inexhaustible wealth of divine truths and express them through a variety of languages and mentalities. Under this pretext they would like to legitimize ambiguous and uncertain expressions of the Faith, and content themselves with research into it in order to avoid affirming it. They would like to turn to the opinion of the faithful in order to know what they wish to believe, and attribute to the faithful a questionable charism of competence and experience, which puts the truth of the Faith at the mercy of the strongest and most easily voiced choices.

"All this happens when one does not submit to the Church's *Magisterium*, which the Lord willed to protect the truths of the Faith."

Faithful and the Faith

It would be easy to fill this and further issues of *Christian Order* with similar statements by the Pope; but what has been quoted is surely sufficient to prove that fears for the future of orthodoxy within the Church represent more than the confusion of ill-informed laymen under the impression that those wishing for "very ordinary implemen-

tations of Vatican II" are "dangerous men". This does not mean, of course, that every allegation of unorthodoxy is well founded. Cardinal John Wright points this out in an article in the December 1973 issue of *Christian Order* in which he discusses the reaction to the *General Catechetical Directory*. But he explains that while some of the complaints concerning alleged variations from the Faith delivered to our Fathers have confused verbal changes with a change in doctrine "other complaints turn out to be only too true and this means that the parents have discovered either that ignorance or partisan theology on the part of the catechist has distorted the content and presentation of the Faith". Cardinal Seper has expressed his faith in the ordinary Faithful as those who will preserve orthodoxy in the Church because, he explains with great regret, some bishops are far too slow in fulfilling their role to defend the authentic teaching of the Church. "If all the bishops would deal with these aberrations as they occur the situation would be different. It is very difficult for us in Rome if we get no co-operation from the bishops", he writes. An American archbishop has recently acknowledged that credit for the action that the hierarchy in that country is now taking to ensure orthodox religious teaching must go to the concerned laity who insisted on exposing and opposing what the bishops now concede to be very dangerous trends, at a time when the bishops did not recognise, or refused to recognise, the gravity of the situation.

Twin Aims of Pro Fide

The twin aims of the Pro Fide Movement are to uphold the authority of the Holy See and to support the authentic teaching of the Church. Obviously it therefore accepts the authorised reforms of Vatican II, but to-day a number of priests and laymen wish to go much further in promoting unauthorised reforms. The policy of the Pro Fide Movement has been to bring what we consider to be "dangerous trends" to the attention of the bishops and the Catholic

community at large. We have not contented ourselves with the kind of vague generalisation which I complained about at the beginning of this article, but have cited, for example, specific publications and provided a detailed explanation of what we consider to be unsatisfactory. We have a Catechetical Committee, which not only benefits from the advice of theologians but is composed almost exclusively of serving teachers, including the heads of all types of secondary and primary school and specialist teachers in religious education. Our criticisms of what we consider to be defective catechetics have been reported or explained in the Catholic Press and in our own publications. So far, in not one instance have we needed to modify or withdraw our criticisms, which have invariably proved to be well founded. One of our recent publications entitled *Doctrine in Catechetics* analysed the doctrinal content of a number of the more commonly used text books and syllabuses in the light of the *General Catechetical Directory* ⁽¹⁾. Every bishop has received a copy, as is the case with our other statements and publications, and neither in this nor in any other instance has a single bishop complained of or disputed what we as a Movement have had to say. Indeed, we have received a number of very appreciative replies from the Hierarchy—particularly concerning this pamphlet. It has also been recommended to its members by the Catholic Teachers' Federation and, although I happen to know that it has provoked a good deal of "behind the scenes" activity by some of the catechists whose syllabuses it proves to be inadequate, not one of them has been able to confront us with a single inaccuracy in our analysis.

I would like to stress that we have never in a single instance attacked the motives, good faith or integrity of those whom we felt bound to criticise. It is unfortunate that those who have criticised us have not always observed the same standards.

(1) Pro Fide Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, price 10p, post free.

The Laity Commission: how Representative?

No-one regrets more than the members of the Pro Fide Movement that such an organisation needs to exist. We would far prefer it if the "dangerous trends" specified by the Holy Father did not exist or if either the bishops or some official body such as the Laity Commission would deal with these trends without prompting from us. However, as the article by the secretary of the Laity Commission in the November 1973 issue of *The Catholic Gazette* makes clear, this body seems to have no intention of concerning itself with issues of vital concern to laymen, parents in particular, but with peripheral issues which preoccupy what, for want of a better word, can be described as the progressive minority. To give just one example, Mr. Muir explains that the Laity Commission felt it should take up the matter of consultation concerning the appointment of auxiliary bishops "because of the groundswell of opinion that seemed to be building up". As an MP, the nature of a "groundswell of opinion" is something on which I can speak with some authority. I am happy to report that there are now at least the beginnings of a groundswell of opinion opposing the current abortion law. Like other MP's, I am able to distinguish between signs which represent an opinion beginning to be held by the population, or a large section of the population, and those which represent a pressure campaign on behalf of some active minority group. I am quite confident that any evidence Mr. Muir could produce to indicate a desire on the part of laymen to be consulted regarding the appointment of bishops would prove to be within the latter category. A similar example of the type of issue which preoccupies the Laity Commission can be found in its unanimous vote to join the British Council of Churches. It would surprise me if more than one or two per cent of the laity in Britain could make an honest claim to know enough about this organisation, and the implications of joining it, to justify asking our bishops to take this step. Having gone

into the matter, I consider that doing so would be most unwise and I am far from alone in thinking this; yet a Commission which, in theory, puts forward the views of the laity recommends this crucial step without a single dissenting voice. Not even at the time when the *Magisterium* came under the strongest attack since the Council, in regard to *Humanae Vitae*, did the Laity Commission come out in support of the Holy Father. According to an article in *The Newman*, many if not most of its members did not accept the Pope's teaching.

Pro Fide is Needed

By now it should be clear why loyal Catholic laymen feel that an organisation like Pro Fide is needed, and will continue to be needed until they can feel confident that some official body exists through which the laity can make their views known to the hierarchy. There is certainly a crisis in the Church; there is, regretfully, a reluctance on the part of some bishops to deal with it effectively and there is not simply a need but an obligation for the orthodox laity to come together to defend the Faith of their Fathers. While we feel free to criticise those whom we believe to be responsible for the crisis we are quite open to criticism ourselves. Anyone who feels that in any instance we have been inaccurate or unfair has only to say so, and if their complaints prove to be accurate we shall acknowledge our error frankly and openly. Our Movement is dedicated to the truth but, as a Movement, we can, of course, only accept responsibility for statements issued officially by our committee. The Pro Fide Movement as such can in no way be responsible for what individual members write or say in a private capacity; just as it would be unjust to attribute to a religious order the views expressed in a personal capacity by one of its "way-out" members.

When the Pro Fide Movement was formed the Holy Father sent us his blessing which we shall endeavour to continue to merit.

Readings at Mass

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

THE second reading on September 8th is an extract from St. Paul's shortest letter—25 verses. It is addressed to a well-to-do Christian named Philemon, probably a native of Colossae, in whose house the faithful used to meet. His slave Onesimus (cf. Col 4,9) had run away after causing his master considerable damage (which Paul says he will make up). Paul had given him refuge and ultimately converted him—"whose father I became while wearing these chains"—probably during his house arrest in Rome (AD 61 - 63).

Though Paul wanted to keep Onesimus with him to help in preaching the Gospel, he sends him back, begging Philemon to welcome him—and by implication asking him not to inflict the severe punishment permitted in such a case by Roman law. It cannot be deduced from this that Paul is asking Philemon to free Onesimus from slavery. Still less is he trying to change the existing social structure (cf. Col 3,22 & 4,1); though the principles on which the letter is based will eventually play a major part in the abolition of slavery. He urges Philemon to welcome his slave "as a brother": he finds it incongruous for one Christian to "own" another (cf. Col 3,11; Gal 3,27-28).

It is possible that Onesimus was in fact sent back to Paul, as the latter had clearly hoped, and that he became in time the bishop of Ephesus (about AD 107-117) of whom St. Ignatius of Antioch wrote. Towards the end of Paul's lifetime, the Church in the region of Ephesus was presided over by Timothy, still a young man (I Tim 4,12), who acted as Paul's representative. On the remaining Sundays of September and through October we hear extracts from Paul's letters to him, the purpose of which is to instruct him in his apostolic work (hence, with that

addressed to Titus in Crete, they are known as the "pastoral" letters). But the content of the letters shows that they were intended to be made public in the Christian community; both end with the words "Grace be with you" in the plural.

"Here is a saying you can rely on"—worthy of belief—in the reading for Sept. 15 probably means that Paul is lending his authority to a quotation from a hymn or creed current in the early Church. For other such quotations I refer you to I Tim 1,17 (at the end of this reading); 3,16; 6,15-16 and II Tim 2,11-13. When Paul says he is "the greatest of sinners" (cf. Eph. 3,8; where "saints" means "faithful" in our modern idiom) this is an expression of humility, not to be taken in a technical sense. The nearer we draw to God, the deeper our unworthiness appears.

"There is only one God, and there is only one mediator between God and mankind, who sacrificed himself as a ransom for them all" (Sept. 22). As against the Greek idea that there exist many saviour-gods or Jewish theories of angels acting as mediators, St. Paul is concerned to show that the one way of salvation is through the historical act of Christ. It is in virtue of his solidarity with men that he pays the ransom for all by his death on the cross. Because of the universal mediatorship of Christ, and his Father's desire that all should be saved, "prayers should be offered for everyone".

"God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe" (4,10). Historically, the majority of men have not been nor are to-day put in a position where they can hear and believe the gospel of Christ. But "God does not forget that the salvation obtained by Christ is for all men in whatever temporal and historical conditions they may find themselves; *for it is he who put them where they are*". (1) For the relation of unbelievers to the Church, see the documents of Vatican II on the Church 16, and on the Church in the Modern World 22. The function of Christians, in

(1) E. Hillman: *The Church as Mission*, p. 72. Italics mine.

the context of this reading, is to offer prayer and thanksgiving on behalf of all mankind (especially in our own milieu) through and with Christ the one Mediator. In the last verse of the reading, "the men" is explained by the fact that the next verse goes on to speak about women. In public worship at that time, only men were permitted to recite the prayers, and the usual attitude was to stand with hands raised, the palms open and facing upward as if to receive a divine gift. "Without anger or quarrelling" simply means that to be at peace with one's neighbour is a condition of effective prayer (Mark 11,25; Matt 5,23-24).

On the last Sunday of the month (which this year displaces Michaelmas) Timothy's confession or profession of faith refers to his baptism as an adult: he was one of Paul's converts (1,2). Jesus himself had witnessed to the truth before Pilate (John 18,36-37) and had carried out his witness even unto death. The mention of the Roman governor in Christian preaching and professions of faith (as to-day in our Creeds) has the purpose of fixing our Lord's redemptive act firmly in history.

Amos was a shepherd belonging to Judah in the south of Palestine whom God had called to prophesy in the northern kingdom of Israel (1,1 & 7,10-17). Around BC 750 Israel was enjoying a period of affluence, but this was based on the decay of true religion and the sufferings of the poor. The latter seem referred to in the phrase "the ruin of Joseph" (6,6). Joseph was looked on as the ancestor of the two large northern tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh. In the first of the two readings (Sept. 22) traders who give short measure for high prices are impatient for rest-days to be over. But the lovers of luxury (Sept. 29) who "feel so safe on the mountain of Samaria" the capital, would be the first to suffer exile when the city was taken by the Assyrians in 721.

An article by Michael Davies in the February (1974) number of *Christian Order* entitled "Ecumania" brought a reply from Canon R. L. Stewart, Secretary of the Ecumenical Commission of England and Wales and Consultor to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Very courteously and considerately Canon Stewart agreed that a reply from Michael Davies should be published alongside his own reply to the original article. This month the two articles are published under the general title of "Ecumenism: Two Views".

Ecumenism: Two Views

I: ECUMINIMALISM??

V. REV. CANON RICHARD L. STEWART

IN one of these rare intervals that can occur between "conferences and study-days, teach-ins, talk-ins, united this and united that", I settled down to read Mr. Michael Davies's article *Ecumania: the Sickness of the Church* (*Christian Order*, February 1974). I may be flattering myself unduly, but as I read on the awful suspicion dawned that even I might be one of those he would consider an "ecumaniac". Of course, I do not consider myself such: I am just an ecumenist, appointed four years ago by the Bishops' Conference (to my own surprise and that of several others) to work full-time for Christian Unity as Secretary of the Ecumenical Commission of England and Wales.

Profound Disagreement with Michael Davies

As the reader will guess, I am in profound disagreement with much that Mr. Davies has to say, and so I have

asked *Christian Order* to find space for a few thoughts from an ecumenist who hopes he is free from maniacal inclinations. I do this not out of any desire to have a fifteen-round contest with Mr. Davies (in my experience such arguments are normally none too productive), but because I think it vital that Catholics should distinguish carefully between the solid advances the Church is making in this field and the occasional, very regrettable excesses that really do merit the name "ecumania"; and which unfortunately get much more publicity than does the steady work that is going on all the time. My main contention is that Mr. Davies fails to make this essential distinction, and that he seems almost to regard every manifestation of ecumenism as in some way "ecumaniac". To answer every single point he makes would take several stout volumes, so I will concentrate on a few points that strike me as fundamental. In particular, I will not comment on his remarks about named individuals, who can properly speak for themselves (though I must admit that, if my hunch is correct, "Fr. Y" is a pretty thin disguise: did he by any chance speak at "W"?).

Turmoil in the Church

No one in his senses would deny that there is a degree of turmoil in the Church to-day, and that this affects very many aspects of Catholic life. But dangers and difficulties have abounded in almost every stage of the Church's long history—the Jansenist trends of the 17th century, the deism of the 18th, the rationalism of the 19th, the humanism of to-day. But those past dangers were met; our present dangers are being met; and I am sure that the Church (even in Britain) will survive to meet and to overcome yet undreamt of dangers in the 21st century. And how does the Church meet such dangers? By living her life to the full, an *outgoing* life, offering to all the power, the teaching and the example of Christ. In doing this she has to reflect on what "the signs of the times" are enabling her

to see yet more clearly about her Master, herself, and her mission. It is when the Church fails to consider these signs, when she withdraws from the world and simply closes in on herself, that real dangers arise. Thus the English martyrs (and surely Pope Paul ensured that their canonization was also an ecumenical occasion) never thought it their task simply to restrict their mission to the surviving Catholic community: their mission was to all, insofar as the circumstances of their day permitted.

Isolationism, Unity and Dialogue

This is my first, perhaps most fundamental difference with Mr. Davies. Unless I misread him, he seems to advocate an "isolationist" stance for the Church. Leave the other Churches, he seems to say, in the mess they have got into; keep ourselves to ourselves; and, when they have declined into virtual non-existence, we shall be left in possession of the field. But what a field! Wouldn't it be a case of making a wilderness and calling it peace? Surely our duty (and at this stage I shall try to refrain from quoting all the apposite Vatican II texts) is to recognise and to welcome all that is truly Christian, all that is ultimately Catholic, in our brethren, to co-operate with them in all that can show the caring and saving Christ to a needy world, and to work hard for the day when we shall all be one.

Mr. Davies says that "to the ecumaniac unity is the be-all and the end-all of life." Perhaps I am an ecumaniac after all! I hope that it is true of the Church and of every Catholic that "unity is the be-all and end-all of life", for the Oneness of the Church is not a static quality but an active gift which imposes on us all a ministry of reconciliation. But we must be careful how we use this word "unity". Mr. Davies goes on to say: "The type of unity does not matter; reaching it is all that counts". *That* is not the outlook of the genuine ecumenist. True, the *pattern* of eventual unity cannot yet be discerned, and we

may not prejudge the future inspirations of the Holy Spirit. But though the pattern may be dim, our faith assures us of so many elements that will most assuredly be there (I need not list them, for they are central to Catholic faith). "Unity at any price" is not the motto of the Catholic ecumenist, or indeed of any other ecumenist I have met in the course of dialogue. Which brings me to the matter of dialogue. Quite frankly, it is simply saddening to those of us who are entrusted by the Church with the heavy responsibility of representing her in serious dialogue to come home after, say, a long meeting in which we have been at pains to explain and to *maintain* the Church's teaching on some particular point (I am just back from a taxing meeting at which we had to speak for the Church's authority in interpreting Scripture—and we stuck to it despite weighty opposition)—it is sad to come home from such work, only to find our fellow-Catholics accusing us of working "for unity at any price". But perhaps that is all part of the Cross; which is the real price of unity.

The Windsor Statement

A separate article would be needed to explain why I disagree with Mr. Davies's assessment of the Windsor Statement. But, in passing, I would like to comment on his words: "A series of lectures and meetings to whip up support for the *Windsor Agreement* was organised throughout the country by the Catholic ecumenical establishment—somewhat reminiscent of the manner in which meetings are held to generate . . . enthusiasm for changes in Party policy in the USSR". For my part, I thought the meetings in question happened in a distinctly unorganised way! Their purpose was not to "whip up support" but to explain the Statement and to provide an opportunity for discussing it. Qualified theologians who spoke at these meetings were in accord with the Statement as a whole, even if not with every detail, and to that extent they very

properly sought to convince. But they, and the International Commission itself, make no claim to infallibility; the whole aim of discussion is to get reactions, both critical and favourable, to the work so far done. For they too want to be assured that others, as well as themselves, do find in the Statement the expression of Christian faith in the Eucharist, even if some of the words used are not part of our normal vocabulary. Indeed, reference to the note on the "Status of the Document" attached to the more recent Canterbury Statement on the Ministry, should show why such presentation and discussion are necessary: the Commission offers an instrument to the Churches which it hopes will lead towards organic unity; but the Commission seeks to impose, and can impose, nothing. The true ecumenist, then, would agree with the sub-title on p.100 of *Christian Order*, "Fake Unity Futile". Likewise he is very concerned about "Incompatibility of Moral Teaching" (p.102). It was concern on this very score that led our bishops to defer a decision about Catholic membership of the British Council of Churches, and they were moved to this by the worry on this point expressed by a substantial number of Catholic ecumenical bodies in this country. Only last month the national Ecumenical Commission, at one of its full meetings, devoted much of its time to discussing how to promote the inclusion of moral issues into our dialogue with other Churches at every level. Let it be clear that this was not with a view to "a dilution of Catholic moral teaching" but precisely because we are so convinced that in this vital field the Catholic Church has so much to offer, as well as something to learn. For we enter dialogue, whether on doctrinal or on moral issues, not to "give way" or to "give up", but quite simply to *give*. We have the humble responsibility of those who, through God's gift, have so much to offer; and the greatest treason would be to refuse to offer it, to bury our talent. And we can *learn* as well from all that there is of truth in the understanding of other Christians, and from the ways in which they live out that truth.

Ecumenism and Evangelization

Space and time are running out on me, so I will confine myself to two more brief points. Mr. Davies asserts that "the argument that the divisions among Christians present an obstacle to the evangelization of the country is ludicrous" (p.104). But I read in Vatican II's Decree *Ad Gentes*, on the Missionary Activity of the Church, an unambiguous sentence: "The division among Christians damages the most holy cause of preaching the Gospel to every creature and blocks the way to faith for many" (art 15). I accept what the Council says. Mr. Davies says a little later that insistence on this "provides *the* ideal excuse for neglecting this evangelization". Clearly this should not be so, and I do not think it proved that it is so. We cannot suspend our mission until unity is achieved: but we must face up to the close relationship there is between unity and mission: Our Blessed Lord's prayer was "That they may be one, *that the world may believe*". Herein lies the significance of the projects in joint evangelism that, for all their varying success, are a feature of the English scene to-day. What Churches *can* say together they *should* say together, not just to reassure one another but to lead men to Jesus Christ. And in this still imperfect co-operation God's grace can, and surely will, lead them closer to one another, to present a clearer sign to an unbelieving world. In a sentence that is also featured in the display at the start of the article Mr. Davies states that "in the unlikely event of an announcement being made to-morrow that all the major denominations have reached complete agreement . . . and had united in one Christian Church, its impact on the evangelization of this country would be precisely nil." I agree wholeheartedly—*not* because unity would make no difference to the effectiveness of mission, but rather because no one can seriously entertain the hypothesis that unity could ever come about in some sort of overnight-announcement-from-on-high fashion. It will be a slower process, a more Christian process, a gift of grace and not a political arrangement: for it is not a ques-

tion of compromise and coalitions, but of growing together in Christ. But as, in God's good time, we grow together, we should surely be a more potent leaven in the lump.

The British Council of Churches

Finally Mr. Davies has a few sharp words about the British Council of Churches. It should be clearly understood that our Bishops have *not* decided *against* joining the Council (I write this in early March): they have deferred their decision⁽¹⁾, and this decision has not led to the "conferences, conclaves and manifestoes" of which the article speaks. In his closing paragraph, Mr. Davies claims that the whole purpose of the article is "to urge every concerned Catholic to do all in his power to oppose Catholic membership of the BCC". We should remember that in April 1972 the Bishops made a similar appeal, asking for opinions (not necessarily for opposition) from Catholics all over the country on this very issue. I hope that *at that time* all concerned Catholics *gave* their views, whether for or against, whether personally or through organisations to which they belong. For it was on the basis of these replies that the Bishops resolved, in Low Week 1973, not to apply for membership *until* certain outstanding issues (mainly ethical and financial), on which the Catholic community had expressed concern, had been fully ventilated. For this purpose they appointed three bishops, led by Archbishop Murphy of Cardiff, to hold further discussions with the BCC. By the time this article appears the Bishops may have reached a further decision. This may be for or against membership, and in either case I shall happily support it. For the Church "commends this work (i.e. ecumenical work) to bishops everywhere in the world for their skilful promotion and prudent guidance" (*Decree on Ecumenism*, art. 4), and like Mr. Davies I am convinced that most, indeed all, of our bishops are still basically orthodox, to put it no more strongly than that!

(1) At their Low Week meeting this year the Hierarchy decided **not** to join the British Council of Churches.

2: "LET THEM RETURN TO THEIR FATHER"

MICHAEL DAVIES

BEFORE commenting on Canon Stewart's reply to my February article I must first congratulate him upon receiving his new title and then say how sad it is to note that he feels it necessary to compare a discussion with a fellow Catholic to "a fifteen round contest"—in contrast, no doubt, with the fruitful and productive dialogues held with our separated bretheren. It would appear that there is now a stigma attached to membership of the household of the faith.

Crisis of Faith

Canon Stewart is quite correct in urging a study of "the signs of the times". Any realistic appraisal of the present state of the ecumenical movement must be made within the context of these signs. The most important, the most manifest, and the most crucial of these signs is that the Western Church is in process of disintegration, and that this disintegration is the work of forces acting from within the Church. It is, as Pope Paul explains, a process of self-destruction; that accelerated decomposition of Catholicism which, Fr. Bouyer insists, we must admit is taking place if we are honest with ourselves. As recently as March 21, 1974, the *Osservatore Romano* published an article by the late Cardinal Danielou in which he stated: "The Church is threatened by a real disintegration which is taking place within: a crisis of obedience, a crisis of faith, a crisis of holiness. All this is threatening the Church to-day when our civilisation needs her presence in order to find its values". Cardinal Heenan observes that: "One does not need to be a prophet to realise that without a dramatic reversal of the

present trend there will be no future for the Church in English speaking countries". *1

It is important to point out here that there is no incompatibility between such predictions and Our Lord's promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church. Fr. Robert E. Southard explains in the April issue of *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* that: "The Catholic Church will survive on this planet until the end of time, believing, teaching and practising essentially what Christ wills of her. To guarantee this, he has promised us the abiding presence of the Father, the Holy Spirit and himself. But we must understand this promise correctly. The Church in this or that particular place can be destroyed. There are limits to Christ's promise. It applies to the Church as a whole, not to every member or parish or diocese; not even to nations as a whole". Fr. Bruckberger writes, in his famous *Open Letter to Jesus Christ*: "The Church can very well find itself reduced to a very small number one day, to a handful of inflexible faithful held in contempt by all, lying in a dungeon. This would still be the Church, Your Beloved Spouse, in the midst of the universal apostasy".

In his celebrated essay, *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*, Cardinal Newman mentions the "temporary suspense of the function of the *Ecclesia docens*" (teaching Church) between the Council of Nicea, A.D. 325, and the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. During this period "The Body of Bishops failed in their confession of the faith. They spoke variously, one against another; there was nothing, after Nicea, of firm, unvarying, consistent testimony, for nearly sixty years. There were untrustworthy Councils, unfaithful Bishops; there was weakness, fear of consequences, misguidance, delusion, hallucination, endless, hopeless, extending itself into nearly every corner of the Catholic Church. The comparative few who remained faithful were discredited and driven into exile; the rest were

(1) *Times Literary Supplement*, 22 December, 1972.

either deceivers or were deceived". The Faith was saved by members of the laity who were faithful to their baptism and "were the ecclesiastical strength of Athanasius, Hilary, Eusebius of Vercellae, and other great solitary confessors, who would have failed without them".

It is of no exaggeration to describe the state of the Church in the West as an universal apostasy. Two American priest-sociologists, Fathers Greeley and McCready, conducted research on the state of the Church in the U.S.A. in 1972 and 1973 for the National Research Centre in Chicago. Their conclusions are that the Church as it has been known in America is finished. The decline in Mass attendance "has reached catastrophic proportions". "We know of no other time in the course of human history," they claim, "when so many people — particularly older people — so decisively removed themselves from canonically required ecclesiastical practices". In questions of doctrine and morality they find that Catholics and Protestants are becoming virtually indistinguishable and that the prospects of a significant proportion of the younger generation continuing to regard themselves as Catholics are remote in the extreme. "The remarkable thing is that no outside foe destroyed us; we destroyed ourselves", they remark in the detached manner affected by professional sociologists. Some statistics indicating the present unhealthy state of the Church in England and Wales appear on another page of this issue. Depressing as these figures may be, they are positively heartening when compared with the equivalent statistics from the U.S.A., France, or Holland. It is also important to note that this decline is even more marked among Protestant denominations than within the Church. A survey of Free Church membership reported in the *Catholic Herald* (19th March, 1971) revealed that the decline had been so catastrophic that there would be an early death for some denominations unless they are merged. Membership of the Baptist Church, for example, has declined by 30 per cent in the last thirty years. The Methodists lost 50,000 full members between 1968 and 1972. Dr. Leslie Paul, a leading Anglican

layman, has produced a most detailed analysis of the present state of the Church of England in which he not only foresees its possible demise but states that "If it does happen it may never be noticed"! The key difference between the decline in the Catholic Church and that in Protestant denominations is that theirs is a long-standing phenomenon while, in this country at least, ours did not begin until we involved ourselves in the ecumenical movement. In my February article, I wrote at length of a study carried out in the U.S.A. which revealed that denominations which do not involve themselves in this movement are healthy, flourishing, and increasing at a faster rate than the national population. Those denominations which do involve themselves in the ecumenical movement are in a state of stagnation or decline—a curious reward for involving themselves in a movement, which is reputedly inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Unwillingness to Recognise the Crisis

I have taken the trouble to establish at some length the fact that we are in the midst of a crisis of faith which can be described accurately as an universal apostasy because so many clerics seem unable to realise, or unwilling to admit, that such a crisis exists. Canon Stewart does concede that "No one in his senses would deny that there is a degree of turmoil in the Church today . . ." He also claims that ". . . our present dangers are being met"—without specifying what he considers these dangers to be, who is meeting them, and in what way. The crisis has been accurately described by the Lutheran theologian, Professor Oscar Cullmann, an observer at Vatican II, as "the crumbling of faith". He echoes what Pope Paul has been stating week after week, year after year. "In our days too", writes Professor Cullmann, "whether Catholic or Protestant, we know that there are legitimate adaptations which we must make in the manner in which we put our preaching over but the substance of his Gospel was never modified by the apostle Paul, nor must the Churches modify it, to escape the

scornful amusement of the Athenians". Cullmann does not hesitate to characterise this "adaptation" as a "capitulation to the world" and the reduction of the Christian message to just repeating what the "world" already says.*² He sees this trend reflected in the ecumenical movement not simply in what Canon Stewart characterises as "occasional, very regrettable excesses" but as, "unhappily, very largely a matter of the fashion of the day. It would seek reunion at any price whatever, without regard to the foundations of the Faith, or to the particular charism and mission of the Churches which it pretends to unite. In such circumstances I find it my duty to apply the brakes to an ecumenism which I must stigmatise as false". Fr. Battista Mondin, professor of theology at the Pontifical Propaganda College for missionary seminarians, expressed similar sentiments in the *Osservatore Romano* of March 14th, 1974. "The unity with which many radicals are content today is exactly the opposite of the unity willed by Christ, the Apostles and the early Church. It is the unity of indifferentism and unconcern, the unity of personal will, the unity of the devaluation of everything that means order, truth and discipline. It is the unity of mere emotion and of blind and uncontrolled instinct". Professor Mondin considers that in pursuit of this aim some Catholic theologians have become less Catholic than such Protestants as Cullmann or Mascall "on some fundamental points of Catholic doctrine such as the priesthood, Holy Eucharist, the infallibility of the pope . . ."

A New Religion

A distinguished Catholic biblical scholar, Fr. van der Ploeg, O.P., Professor of Old Testament theology at Nijmegen University, believes that ecumenism, even as understood by advocates as enthusiastic as Canon Stewart, is very much *passé* for the radicals to whom Fr. Mondin referred: "Some modernists knowing their ideas shall necessitate a total transformation of the Church, already begin to realise that this

(2) FAITH, January 1972; L'Osservatore, June 14, 1973.

total transformation shall lead to a completely new and unforeseen situation. Together with some Protestants they begin to dream of what has already been called a 'third confession', a kind of new religion, neither Catholic nor Protestant, but a 'community of Christ', a world fraternity of all those to whom Jesus of Nazareth in some way or another 'appeals'. This fraternity shall not be an institution of course (and beware), and certainly not one with supernatural claims. The ecumenical movement is trying to re-establish the unity of all churches, but this is not what the Third Religion Movement aims at. For it, the time of ecumenism has definitely gone (Van de Pol, Nymen); the churches should not be united but pulled down, to make room for the new 'confession' (a bad word, because it is traditionally linked up with a confession of faith), the new humanistic 'religion', sprinkled with some sauce of Christian origin".*³

Transconfessional Heresy

This danger of absorption into some amorphous "third confession" is also appreciated by perceptive Anglicans. In the February, 1974 issue of *Veritas*, review of the Anglican Association, the Rev. F. D. Moss expresses his fear that "Should W.C.C.-type ecumenism prevail, Anglicanism will be absorbed, and that is all that can be said with certainty". He notes in the same issue the ominous progress which has been made in the liturgical field—new Catholic and Anglican liturgies have been produced which not only approximate closely, but which avoid being specific on doctrines which would not be accepted by non-conformists. He quotes with approval Cardinal Heenan's opinion, in the article already cited, that "Orthodoxy, and if the word may still be used, heresy have become transconfessional. Dispute is centred on the Word—both the written word and the Incarnate Word. The key question is still, What think you of Christ?" Protestant modernists such as Bultmann have, as

(3) C.P.A. Newsletter, Vol. III, 1973.

the Cardinal points out, explained "away the whole Gospel. In his reasonable desire to correct false historicism (the gospels are not *purely* historical accounts) he undermined their historicity. He described his demolition work as demythologizing. In his view, the story of Christ is no more historical than the story of creation in Genesis is scientific. The Incarnation, the virgin birth, the Trinity and, of course, the resurrection are all myths. It is as absurd to talk of God on earth as God in heaven. The whole concept of mystery is invalid". This problem of transconfessional heresy is already showing signs of resulting in an *unofficial* ecumenical movement between traditional Christians of differing denominations which could eventually prove very fruitful. It is based on the key-question put forward by Cardinal Heenan, "What think you of Christ?" Those who think Him to be God and those who do not are obviously far closer to those sharing their views in other denominations than to those who do not in their own. I am quite certain that my beliefs approximate far more closely to those of Mr. Moss and the members of the Anglican Association than they do to those of a priest such as Fr. Hubert Richards whose latest book, *The First Christmas*, is a straightforward modernist tract from beginning to end.

What Must be Done

It might appear that up to this point I have failed to reply in detail to Canon Stewart's criticisms of my article. What I have tried to do is to place his preoccupation with ecumenism within the context of the current crisis—and given that the crisis is as serious as I have shown, and that its causes are those I have cited, it is quite clear that the ecumenical movement is not simply irrelevant to any possible solution but is the principal contributory factor to the crisis. "Quid faciendum?" asks Fr. Rudolph Harvey in the April 1974 issue of the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*. "What can be done? What should be done? What must be done?"

"Someone must do what Leo XIII did through Cardinal Mercier at Louvain, and for exactly the same reason. Someone must answer the question: Who's in charge here?"

"Our people are being confounded beyond confusion. Scandal is too light a word for the suffering they are undergoing. Catechetical texts bristling with nontheistic humanism are given to their children for instruction. Homilists demean pious practices and deride devotion. Apostacy is glamorized. It is inexcusable to allow the sorry situation to continue."

Answering the question as to who is in charge can only be done effectively by action; and this action must involve action within our own house rather than endless discussions with those outside. Fr. Harvey continues: "No law of the land or of the Netherlands compels anyone to become or to remain Catholic, but to profess Catholicism while rejecting the constant tradition of the Church and the express teaching of the Roman Pontiff must be judged ridiculous by any impartial observer". It is, as Fr. Crane has observed, "Time for the chop"! Those like Fr. Hubert Richards whose writings make it clear that they are no longer Catholics must be deprived of their right to use this title and the status which it gives to their views. This is not reactionary or unchristian; it is a view which enjoys strong biblical support and is clear common sense. It may already be too late to arrest the decline which has set in; but if it is to be arrested this can only be done by returning to a position where the Catholic Church has clear doctrinal, moral, and social teaching, an inspiring liturgy, and firm discipline in such matters as the wearing of habits by religious (the latter may seem a trivial point but the increasing abandonment of religious dress is symptomatic of the sickness undermining religious life in this country and its restoration would be the first step in a return to sanity). In the event of such a programme of true renewal being implemented, a good number of priests and religious, together with some of the laity, would formally separate themselves from the Church of which they are now members in name only. This could only be of benefit to the Mystical Body which, as Cardinal

Bourne explained, cannot be harmed if "In the exercise of their free will men may abandon it and be no longer within its range, but the unity itself remains unbroken and unimpaired. Their abandonment cannot break or impair it. Like every healthy organism, the one Church possesses the vital faculty of rejecting and ejecting every element that menaces its vitality or organic unity".⁽⁴⁾

Doctrine Compromised by Official Spokesmen

Nor is there any hope of a cure for the present sickness while the faithful witness official spokesmen of the Church compromising her most precious doctrines, even her teaching on the Eucharist, God's most precious gift to man; for our Eucharist is God the Son Incarnate. It is of no use Canon Stewart claiming that those "who are entrusted with the heavy responsibility of representing her in serious dialogue" do not compromise the Faith. The two Agreed Statements prove beyond any possible doubt that these official representatives are prepared to do precisely this. In a letter to *The Universe* published on February 15, 1974, I demonstrated that these Statements do not require belief in the doctrines that there is any such thing as a priestly character distinct not merely in degree but in essence from the common priesthood of all the faithful; that a priest can do anything that a layman cannot do; that the Mass is a sacrifice; that a priest has the power to forgive sins; that the apostles appointed bishops and established an unbroken chain down to the present day. My letter was later supported by Fr. F. Tierney and Fr. J. Tolhurst, the latter pointing out that the March issue of *Faith*, which included articles by scholars of the calibre of Fr. David Knowles, "fully confirms what Mr. Michael Davies and Fr. Tierney have written". It was heartening to note that, at their Low Week meeting, our Bishops declined to accept the Canterbury Statement as it stood and referred it back to the International Commission for clarification. Now if these deficiencies were

(4) Introduction to *Montalium Animos*.

obvious to a primary school teacher like myself, could Canon Stewart seriously maintain that they must not have been equally obvious to the trained theologians on the International Commission? Could he further deny that in view of the fact that they set their signatures to this travesty of the Catholic Faith I was quite justified in accusing them of working "for unity at any price"? Canon Stewart finds it "simply saddening" to come home after a long ecumenical meeting and find such accusations being made—I find it not simply saddening but a cause of grave scandal that our official ecumenists are prepared to compromise the Faith to an extent which makes such accusations a Christian obligation. To quote the Vatican II *Decree on Ecumenism*: "The manner and order in which Catholic belief is explained should in no way become an obstacle to the dialogue with our brethren. It is, of course, essential that doctrine be clearly presented in its entirety. Nothing is so foreign to the spirit of ecumenism as a false conciliatory approach which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its assured genuine meaning".

A Question of Method

Canon Stewart also objects to my analogy between the attempts to obtain support for the Windsor Agreement and the methods used to generate enthusiasm for party policy in the U.S.S.R. I must totally reject his claim that the proponents of these Statements have the desire to receive critical reactions or to take part in any constructive discussions. They have throughout behaved essentially as politicians intent on forcing through a programme against all opposition. There was, for example, no attempt made to answer the case put forward in my letter to *The Universe*—and this could have been done simply by referring to passages in the statement which did affirm that there is a specifically priestly character; that a priest does have powers denied to a layman; that the Mass is a sacrifice; that the apostles did appoint bishops and establish an unbroken chain

down to the present day. My letter was not answered because *no such passages exist*. The Catholic representatives could have sent articles defending the Statements to such journals as *Faith*, *The C.P.A. Newsletter*, or *The Keys of Peter* in which scholarly articles criticising the Statements have appeared. I am quite certain that any such replies would have been printed. To the best of my knowledge no attempt whatsoever has been made to do so. Neither has there been a reply to the book *The Eucharist: Unity or Truth?* which I reviewed in the July issue of *Christian Order*.

"The basic mistake of the Catholic party," wrote Fr. Knowles in *Faith* (March 1974), "was to forget that they were not engaged in an exercise such as that of politicians and trade unionists in avoiding a confrontation by withdrawing extreme conditions and appearing to yield (and often actually yielding) precious ground, but in the endeavour to attain a deeper agreement by presenting Catholic truth in its deepest and most spiritual and essential (and therefore in its most truly attractive) form".

The analogy with politicians, and totalitarian politicians at that, has been made even more apt by subsequent actions. Bishop Clark has used his position as chairman of the C.T.S. to ban *Faith* and *The Keys of Peter* from the C.T.S. bookshop. He has been plaintiff, prosecuting council, and judge in his own cause. The defendants have not been told the nature of the charges against them or allowed any defence. At the same time journals which openly defy the official teaching of the Church continue to be sold by the C.T.S. A study day on the Canterbury Statement, at which Canon Stewart was present, was held in the diocese of Arundel and Brighton in March. A friend of mine, a young teacher who lives in the diocese, asked me to accompany him to the study day at which Bishop Clark was to speak; I agreed to go and my name was placed upon his parish list. Two days before the meeting there arrived what must certainly be the most extraordinary letter I shall ever receive. It came from the Secretary of the Ecumenical Commission, Fr. P. R.

Oliver, who informed me that he had seen the name of M. Davies upon the list. It had been suggested to him that I might be the person concerned although he did not know whether or not this was the case. If I was the person concerned I could not go as he was having to turn down applications from non-diocesans. If I was not the person concerned, he apologised for troubling me! If I was, he hoped that I would understand!

Much to the embarrassment of Fr. Oliver a letter subsequently appeared in the *Catholic Herald* from a progressive Catholic who did not live in the diocese and who had been present at the study day and deplored the fact that opponents of the Agreed Statement had not been present to express their views. I then wrote a letter which evoked a reply from Fr. Olivier conceding that four people from outside the diocese had been allowed to come. I have since learned that two other people known to have conservative views were prevented from attending from outside the diocese and that conservative Catholics inside the diocese were denied places on the ground that they had all been allocated. A friend of one lady whose application had been turned down on these grounds applied on the following day, giving a fictitious name which could not have been included on a possible blacklist; she was told that places were still available! To complete this somewhat squalid little tale I have since discovered that at least two people who did go walked out in disgust at the manner in which they felt the study day had been "rigged". The participants were split into pre-arranged groups with previously appointed chairmen and only these chairmen were allowed to put questions to Bishop Clark.

I am not suggesting for one moment that Fr. Stewart had anything to do with these arrangements, but what this story makes very clear is that there must be something very dubious about a viewpoint which can only be imposed by banning journals likely to oppose it, by compiling blacklists of individuals who might do so; and by refusing to enter into any sort of dialogue with those holding other views.

Dialogue, Ecumenism and Evangelization

In the article which has already been cited, Fr. R. E. Southard concludes with these words: "I suggest that all ecumenists adjust their sights and dialogue the question of unity among Catholics—specifically unity of Eucharistic belief and practice. When this most crucial, substantial, essential issue has been resolved, other matters can be seen in their proper perspective. For if Christ is divided, Person from body, disembodied, depersonalised in the Eucharist, then we Catholics are truly divided, member from member; members from the Head. How then can we presume to offer to others a unity which we ourselves do not have?"

"I conclude on a symbolic note. 'Ecumenism' derives from the Greek word *oikos* meaning 'house'. Here, then, it is appropriate to repeat the wisdom of Lincoln: 'A house divided against itself cannot stand'".

I most certainly stand by my contention that "the argument that the divisions among Christians present an obstacle to the evangelisation of the country is ludicrous". I quite agree that the quotation which Canon Stewart cites against me, taken from the Decree on the *Missionary* activity of the Church, is quite valid with regard to the missions. For a pagan people to have representatives of different denominations competing for their allegiance would certainly be harmful; but the existence of divisions among Christians is a fact with which everyone born in this country is familiar, and in an age of universal education all should have some idea of when and why they occurred. The projects of "joint evangelisation", which Canon Stewart obviously approves, are a contradiction of the very nature of the Catholic Church and her unique claims. In point of fact, the whole question is academic as no one is evangelising this country at the moment. The abysmal decline of British Christianity, in which we are now involved, proves that far from the gospel of Christ being preached to the world and bringing in a stream of converts to build

up the Mystical Body, the lure of the world is drawing more and more Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, away from their religious allegiance. Canon Stewart does not think that ecumenism is providing an excuse for neglecting the evangelisation of Britain. Let him compare the amount of effort, the amount of money, the number of committees and commissions devoted to ecumenism with the effort devoted to bringing the unbelieving millions of this country into the One, True, Church of Christ. The conversion figures speak for themselves—a Church with perhaps six million members, in which every confirmed adult should be an apostle and witness to Christ, can only succeed in attracting 5,000 converts in a year while its own members drift away by the ten thousand! If there is one thing that is clear about the image of the new Church, the “Church Dialogueing” rather than the “Church Teaching”, it is that it holds far less attraction for those outside than did the image of the much maligned pre-Conciliar Church. Nor, if the Catholic Church is to engage in projects of joint evangelisation *on equal terms* with Protestant denominations and present itself simply as one of a number of options available to the evangelised (in the event of there being any), can it be denied that Catholic and non-Catholic alike are being quite logical in interpreting this as an admission that “one religion is as good as another”, a formula for indifferentism in which the number of converts will dwindle and the faithful will drift away.

In an address to the World Methodist Conference in 1966 Cardinal Heenan warned: “There is almost a fraternity of international conference speakers who appear on both sides of the Atlantic at meetings of every theological complexion. There is no little danger that the multiplication of conferences will lead to a neglect of pastoral action. If too much time is spent in speculation there will be too little spent in preaching the word of God. That, incidentally, is one of the dangers of ecumenism. We can become so engrossed in discussing each other’s theology that the flocks committed to our care may begin to disperse.” As I have

already pointed out, the members of other communions had been dispersing at an accelerating rate for some time. While we remained outside the ecumenical movement our Church remained the heartening and edifying exception to this rule.

Isolationism or City on a Hill?

This brings me to what Canon Stewart has correctly identified as the key point in my February article—the advocacy of what he terms “an ‘isolationist’ stance for the Church”. I would not use this somewhat emotive word myself: I would prefer to describe my position as an appeal to the Church to be true to her own nature, that of a city set on a hill calling all men to herself. Of course the various Protestant denominations will decline “into virtual non-existence”. This has always been the fate of those who cut themselves off from the Body of Christ—to divide and to disappear. But to insist on the Church being true to herself, manifesting that she is not simply one of a group of sects (all of which have good and bad points), but nothing less than the Bride of Christ, this is not to show any lack of love or concern for our separated bretheren. I am in total agreement with Canon Stewart when he states that the Church overcomes dangers “By living her life to the full, an *outgoing* life, offering to all the power, the teaching and the example of Christ”.

He is equally correct in stressing that our mission to-day, as was the mission of the English martyrs, is not simply “to the surviving Catholic community” (a phrase that may soon be equally applicable to our own epoch) but “to all, insofar as the circumstances of their day permitted”. Canon Stewart’s evident *non-sequitur* here is to identify the Church’s mission to non-Catholics with the type of ecumenical initiative which he endorses, which would have included joining the British Council of Churches. My view is still that expressed in the February article, that the mission of the Church to the whole community can best

be accomplished, can *only* be accomplished, by withdrawing completely from the ecumenical movement in its present form, a movement which is incompatible with the true Catholic ecumenism, endorsed by the Fathers of Vatican II.

We must, of course, "welcome all that is truly Christian, all that is ultimately Catholic, in our bretheren". There are occasions in which we can co-operate with them on *specific* projects to show "the caring and saving Christ to a needy world". In the event of major disasters, such as floods and earthquakes, a common Christian approach is dictated by common sense. The avoidance of duplicated effort is a welcome and sensible step forward. Co-operation with Protestants (and even non-Christians and atheists) in such spheres of common interest as the anti-abortion or anti-pornography campaigns should also be encouraged. The most Catholic speech at the recent anti-Abortion rally in Hyde Park was made by Malcolm Muggeridge (who is normally the only individual to put forward the Catholic viewpoint on TV)! We should also "work hard for the day when we shall all be one"—providing that we do not make the mistake of imagining that working for union with Protestants, rather than preaching the Gospel to all men, is the prime role of the Church. Where I would disagree with Canon Stewart would be on the most effective means of working "for the day when we shall all be one". The Church can bring Christ to those outside her most effectively not by engaging in endless dialogues which achieve nothing and lead nowhere (what have they achieved and where have they led?) but by maintaining the purity of her doctrine and worship and seeking, above all, to increase the holiness of her own members; for it is above all holy Catholics who will bring in new members to share the sacramental life of the Body of Christ, which is the source of this holiness. Like Fr. Stewart, I am happy to support the decision of our bishops with regard to membership of the British Council of Churches; and it is my prayer that, in not joining the B.C.C., our bishops may have taken a first and vital step towards reasserting the true nature of the

Catholic Church and a return to the *only* valid basis for Catholic ecumenism, as explained by Pope Pius XI in *Mortalium Animos*. The Fathers of Vatican II felt that a change of policy was called for, but it is important to point out that such a change in policy was not necessarily inspired by the Holy Ghost. While the Holy Ghost will protect a General Council from teaching error it is no part of our faith that He will automatically protect either Council or Pope from policy decisions which may prove to be ill founded. Burning heretics was once part of the official policy of the Church. Nothing could induce me to believe that the Holy Ghost inspired such a means of propagating a Gospel of love.

Return to the Teaching of Pius XI

This policy, like many others, has been changed—and now that our involvement in the ecumenical movement is manifestly a disaster, both for the Church and for those outside it, there can be no shame in returning to the wise teaching of Pius XI in *Mortalium Animos*, a teaching which had the endorsement of two thousand years. “There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away. The one true Church of Christ is visible to all, and will remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it. The mystical spouse of Christ has never in the course of centuries been contaminated, nor in the future can she ever be, as Cyprian bears witness: ‘The bride of Christ cannot become false to her Spouse; she is inviolate and pure. She knows but one dwelling, and chastely and modestly she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber’ . . . Furthermore, in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize, and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. Did not the ancestors of those who are now

entangled in the errors of Photius and of the Reformers obey the Bishop of Rome, the chief shepherd of souls? Their children, alas! have left the house of their fathers, but that house did not therefore fall to the ground and perish forever, for it was supported by God. Let them, then, return to their Father, who, forgetting the insults in the past heaped upon the Apostolic See, will accord them a most loving welcome. If, as they constantly say, they long to be united with Us and Ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church 'the mother and mistress of all Christ's faithful'? Let them heed the words of Lactantius: 'The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this is the house of faith, this is the temple of God: if any man enter not here, or if any man go forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation' . . . Let our separated children, therefore, draw nigh to the Apostolic See . . . and let them come, not with any intention or hope that 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth', will cast aside the integrity of the faith and tolerate their errors, but to submit themselves to its teaching and government".

Canon Stewart claims that "the pattern of eventual unity cannot yet be discerned, and we may not prejudge the future inspirations of the Holy Spirit". I regret that I must end this article on a note of total disagreement. While it is far from certain that all Christians will ever be united within the one true Church (the Church itself has been united from the day when it was established by Christ and its divinely constituted and divinely protected unity can never be broken), if such unity ever does come about, as we must devoutly hope and pray that it will, it can only be according to the very clear pattern described by Pope Pius XI. While we cannot prejudge the future inspirations of the Holy Ghost we can be certain that He would not lead the one true Church into a contradiction of its own nature.

Chile: How Much did the Soviet Know?

CZESLAW JESMAN

AGAINST the West in general and Great Britain in particular, Soviet psychological warfare has set up as its current martyr-figure the late and none-too-disingenuous President Allende of Chile. There is little point in continuing to denounce this warfare and expose its inner springs, for these should be known by this time to anyone who has the slightest knowledge of Soviet techniques in this field. What we are interested in here is an apparent, unpremeditated slip made by the Kremlin and indicating that it was a party to preparations for a Communist coup in Chile designed to wipe out Allende's opponents and give him total and totalitarian power over a Communist State. The military Junta have always insisted that they knew of this plot and that their successful coup against Allende was designed to pre-empt it; which it did. Now there comes evidence from a different quarter that the plot did, in fact, exist and that the Soviet Government was a party to it. The evidence is circumstantial, but it is very powerful—especially for those who know anything about the Soviet mind and its methods.

In Russian, *Ogonek* means *Little Flame*. As such, it is the name of a garish, profusely illustrated weekly in the Soviet Union, designed to delight vast numbers of Soviet readers (it has no foreign-language editions). Its circulation is 2 million and its general tone is far more attractive than that represented by the grey uniformity of the usual run of Soviet newspapers and periodicals. If only for this reason, it is nursed by the *Glavit*—the psychological indoctrination men or “thought police” of the Soviet Union—with particular care. Their perfectly sound assumption is that it is easier to catch more flies with a spoonful of honey than a

barrel of vinegar. In their hands, *Ogonek* has become a powerful weapon of indoctrination within the Soviet Union.

The surprising thing is that, when it came to giving coverage to the Chilean counter-revolution, which put Allende out and the Junta in, *Ogonek* was surprisingly and revealingly muddled; the *Little Flame* shed an uncertain light. This is strange for, ever since his constitutional and democratic election, Chile's Marxist President had been given a hero's build-up by the Soviet Union and its Satellites. This is very understandable if only for the fact that, from the standpoint of psychological warfare, he represented a much more suitable candidate for the post of Latin-American Father-Figure than the flamboyant, erratic, none-too-reliable and extremely expensive Fidel Castro of Cuba. Allende's middle-class origins, his unwarlike, almost leninesque appearance and overt credibility as a "man of the Coalition of the Left" were powerful assets where Moscow's long-term policy-plans for South America were concerned. Allende was unlikely to scare off the genuinely disgruntled, but non-Marxist masses of that continent by demeanour or, indeed, by words. He was, from the Soviet angle, an ideal type for the job in hand.

In the Spring of 1973, Ilya Glazunov, the painter equivalent of Yevtushenko, the poet (a licensed "rebel", that is, for western consumption), was sent to Chile to paint a portrait of President Allende, with his presidential sash slung across a modest dark suit—the sort of gear that could be worn on festive occasions by any member of the Politbureau. However, issue no. 44 of *Ogonek* would seem to indicate that Glazunov, whilst in Chile, was also meant to record on canvas what Moscow thought would be the final triumph of the Marxist Revolution in that country and which was, in fact, pre-empted by the Junta's counter-coup. The story, in abbreviated form, is set down in the remainder of this article. The evidence, let me remind the reader, is circumstantial. Those who know the Soviet mind will recognise it as exceedingly strong.

Issue no. 44 of *Ogonek* was datelined October 27th,

1973. Copy was sent to the printers (*Pravda* press) on October 8th and the text was finally approved for release on October 23rd. By that date, however, Salvador Allende was dead and buried. The military coup which toppled him broke out with a naval mutiny at 2 a.m. in Valparaiso on September 11, 1973. By 2 p.m. of the same day Allende had committed suicide in the Presidential Palace in Santiago, after it had been attacked at short length, but very vigorously by the Chilean Army and Air Force. The counter-coup itself, of course, came almost inevitably out of the mounting wave of increasingly widespread discontent which rolled over the country in the Summer of 1973, though its exact timing was dictated, to no small extent, by its pre-emptive nature. On August 28th, the Chilean Chamber of Deputies passed by 81 votes to 47 a motion appealing to the Heads of the Armed Forces to restore the Constitution and the Rule of Law, which had been grievously bent, if not broken by the President and his followers in and out of government. The motion itself came in the wake of the nationwide lorry owners strike, which was declared on July 27th, 1973. The strike immobilized forty-five thousand lorries and disrupted the national economy. At home in Chile, Allende could find no remedy for this emergency and, on September 7th, appealed to the Argentine Government for an immediate shipment of 1.2 million tons of wheat, lest the country should starve.

Now, it is quite obvious that *Ogonek* did not expect this avalanche of unpleasantness. Ilya Glazunov, its star painter, was in Santiago at least until the beginning of July. We know this. And, at that moment, it still looked very much as if a final Marxist victory in Chile was a foregone conclusion. He painted his pictures in anticipation of this victory. Meanwhile, everything was running according to the expected time-table. This is the first thing to note. The second is that publications of the *Ogonek* type have to be planned well in advance, a long time ahead of their publication. In my own view, issue no. 44 of *Ogonek*, which was published on October 27th, was intended originally to

celebrate the "Chilean October" which was, in fact, preempted by the Junta's counter-coup. My reason for thinking this is that the number itself, which I have carefully studied, and which contains a great deal of material dealing with Chile, is obviously one from which originally intended, triumphalist (revolutionary) material has been scrapped. More especially, the reproductions of Ilya Glazunov's paintings, originally intended to illustrate the triumph of what was thought would be Chile's October Revolution, are now in a colourless setting, quite clearly out of their hoped-for revolutionary context (taken for granted at the time he painted them), obviously altered as to detail to suit the new and, for the Soviet Union, unpleasant situation. A good deal of last-minute "fiddling" had most obviously been going on.

The evidence, I must repeat, is circumstantial; but I believe it to be extremely powerful, pointing to foreknowledge by the Soviet Union of a planned Chilean October and to their involvement in it. Under the circumstances, it becomes increasingly difficult to see how the successful counter-coup mounted by the Armed Forces can be classed as anything less than a perfectly justifiable, patriotic act.

In this article, Father Crane looks at the brutal attack on Princess Anne and her husband in the Mall last March. In order to realise its true significance, we need to see it as an ugly symbol of the strong trend to anarchy in contemporary Britain. The trend itself is here subjected to study and its genesis explained.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Real Subverters

THE EDITOR

THE newscaster, I thought, was in a state close to semi-shock last March when he spoke on TV of the brutal attempt to kidnap Princess Anne a couple of hours beforehand. Understandably so; most were similarly affected, particularly by the first announcement which spoke of assassination rather than kidnapping. Either way it was shattering. How could anyone strike like that not only at a young couple everyone loved, but, through them, at the values enshrined in the Royal Family of which they are members. In those values lies all that is best in anything we, as a people, have done or been. Wittingly or unwittingly, the man who grabbed with such brutal effrontery at the Princess and her husband in the Mall, was grabbing at those values. This, I think, is the point. Deranged or not, he was spitting on those values. As such, consciously or unconsciously, representative of those who would spit now on England as a prelude to bringing it down.

First Stage of a Final Agony

Shocking and yet, in a sense, inevitable. This kind of moment had to come; the confrontation, inaugurated long ago, to reach its pitch. For the ugly incident in the Mall

was essentially the first stage of a final agony; symbolically seen, the near-end of a rotten road. This is the point missed by those who reacted to the attempt on Princess Anne only with talk of tightened security for the Royal Family, capital punishment for kidnappers and so on. Sincerely meant, no doubt, but superficial, this kind of comment failed to reach what is, I think, the heart of the matter; namely, that the attack on the Princess, whatever the personal motive of the attacker, proclaimed in a manner best calculated to shock all into a dim awareness at least of the shape of things to come, the coming end of our world; the chaos inevitably consequent on the final rejection by the immoral pace-setters in this country, those who give tone to its public life, of the values by which we have tried to live in the past and which alone have given us such moments of true greatness as have been ours. Consciously or unconsciously, the attacker in the Mall was proclaiming the coarse creed of the thousands in this country who set its contemporary standards and the hundreds of thousands more who set their lives by them. Their creed can be simply put. It is that nothing is sacred where they are concerned. In proof, the attacker (again, whatever his personal motives) was symbolic in that he singled out for attack the most vulnerable member of the one family in this country most closely identified with those standards. By so doing, he broadcast, in the most devastating way possible, the contempt felt by the thousands he represented for the values by which so many still try to live. Physically, alone he may have been in the attack. Mentally and however unwittingly, he was the companion of thousands. This is the point. What he did was both invitation to the moral anarchy in our midst and an ugly symbol of its existence; an indication that we are now close to the end of the road and of what that end itself will bring. It was a kind of bastard sacrament, that night in the Mall; an outward sign of the rot in men's minds. There was an ugly symbolism about the whole thing that was not only frightful, but frightening. It is just possible that the fright may make us think. This article is in aid of such an operation.

Immoral Pace-Setters: Men against God

For a long time the decay has been piling up like refuse in the minds of many in this country. So many have been so easily led; unwittingly, for the most part, they have been seduced by the immoral pace-setters. One can speak in this context, and rather roughly, of two classes of men; an active minority and a passive, mostly silent, majority. The active minority is not merely agnostic, but godless, actively so; therefore, actively destructive.

It is logical that it should be. Its members have minds; they are mostly intellectual. Theirs is the task of making something of themselves as men. They share this task with other men. Where they differ is in their manner of its attempted fulfilment, for they have rejected God and, therefore, any notion of their total dependence on God and of their obligation, in consequence, to find their true selves only in serving Him. They are left, therefore, with the task—indeed, the craving—of fulfilling themselves independently of their origins, cut off from their roots; which are in God. Meant for Him, they are bound by their denial of Him to try to find fullness of living apart from Him; which can only mean frustration. This is what comes when God is denied and, with that denial, autonomy substituted for true freedom which seeks fulfilment through the service of God within the framework of His law. Thus, the frustration met by the immoral pace-setters is of their own devising. It comes from the pride of those who would make themselves men without God.

"Non Serviam"

Consider their position. The only remedy for their sickness is in surrender to God, but this they will not give. Yet, until they give it—so long, that is, that they seek fulfilment without Him—their lives are reduced to a living contradiction, which finds expression in an ugly and necessarily cumulative process of self-assertion and nothing more; and

the way to that is through destruction, deriding traditional values in order that they may assert their contempt for the Author of those values and so feel good themselves. It is Lucifer's "Non Serviam" constantly repeated in their lives, as it must be if they are to find the twisted brand of satisfaction they must necessarily seek; a constant reassertion, conscious or subconscious, of themselves against God; trampling on God's work where they find it in order to reassure themselves. Destroyers incorporated; they have to be this. These are the real subverters; worse than the Party Reds, who at least have an ideal outside themselves; used by the Party Reds, so often without knowing it, because they are basically so naive; little men trying to make themselves big by tearing at everything above them—order, hierarchy, virtues and values, seeking always for the ultimate perversion that will bring fake consummation to their tawdry lives. Without any capacity for wondering at a world in which God must be seen as supreme; seeking to re-make it, by contrast, in the threadbare image of themselves; natural admirers and allies of Communist Power, which seeks to re-make a whole world in the image of man, seeking to do on a world scale that which they can only hope to achieve within the narrow limits of their workaday lives. Within those lives, however, all is grist to their mill—form in art and literature, honour, rank and hierarchy, beauty and truth and innocence, the whole tradition of a country's past, the patriotism that loves it and the courage that would defend it, courtesy and manners; above all, family and home and human dignity—all those are marked in their book for destruction, for all are grounded in values which stem from belief in a God whose service they have rejected and without whom they would try, in vain, to find themselves.

I speak here not of conspiracy; but essentially of a habit of mind, a breathing together of men without roots—intellectual, clever, brilliant in a brittle way, often charming, in no way wise, self-sufficient and self-centred, autonomous, that is, always, underneath it all, consumed with pride;

"Non Serviam". Instinctively, therefore, against all that decent men stand for. Capable, because clever, of laughing them out of court; deriding the values good men have lived by, on stage and screen and over the air, querying them at school and university, sneering at them in the Press; dominating the commanding moral heights of a society made increasingly permissive as a result of their incessant activity in search of their bogus selves: their world is one in which anything goes, with themselves in charge of the traffic.

"Kicks" for their Own Sake

And so, to no small extent, it has come about, but there is a difference. A generation has, indeed, been created for which anything goes, but the destroyers are no longer in charge of the traffic. It is inevitable that they should not be for, endemic in the world-without-God they have given to the young is a cumulative urge which can end ultimately only in despair and self-destruction. Meanwhile the pressure of the anarchy they have created is upon us and anarchy, of its nature, feeds on itself; it brings not rest, but the urge to a more beastly barbarism; the thrill it seeks can never satisfy because sought in defiance of God's law. Moreover, titillation, of its very nature, can never satisfy; essentially a means, it can never be sought as an end; when it is, it necessarily invites destruction—first of what lies without and then, ultimately, of one's very self: ultimately, it demands extinction, fitting end of a life given over to "kicks" for their own sake. Amongst such "kicks", a brutal bash at a young man and loved Princess would hold high priority, a coveted desecration close to every anarchist's heart; a thing approved in his guts by every contemporary student mobster. Its very occurrence should serve as warning on those who want to hear, of approaching final disaster. One need not be a prophet of gloom to see the beastliness of the happening in the Mall in this light. The wise will take note of it: if you are to fight an evil intelligently, you

must know first what it is all about. You can only cure dry rot by getting at its source; patching about all over the place is useless.

The Real Subverters

In writing as I have above my intention has not been to condemn the present generation; but, rather, to outline the genesis of its anarchic fringe for whom nothing now is sacred. As such, it constitutes a growing menace to the foundations of civilized society. Condemnation I would reserve for the godless, self-sufficient few of previous generations, the immoral pace-setters of yesterday and today who spend their little lives deriding everything in which decent men believe, pulling down all that is good. These are the real subverters—breathing together and finding each other in the common frustration of attempted self-containment, seeking stature for themselves as they feed moral filth to the young; teaching them to be like themselves, who are like Satan in that they will not serve. They have left us with a contemporary generation confused, devoid of true values, without the wonder that childhood should bring, sad, therefore, old before its time; but still, thank God, with so much to it that is good; its instinct for what is right not yet wholly blunted; in its heart a longing to break free from the world of grab that surrounds it and the cynical materialism on which it has been fed; frightened more than it would admit by the anarchic, adolescent sub-culture within its midst, sick-minded drop-outs dedicated to violence for its own sake, their goal the ultimate degradation of self-destruction, which shows now in their filthy clothes and uncouth manners; like Hitler, wanting to bring down as much as they can with them when they go. It was of these and the disease in their minds that the happening in the Mall on March 20th was an ugly symbol; a stark foretaste, too, of worse that could come.

Permissive Humanitarianism

There is no reason at all why the worst should come.

It is important to remember this right away. The destroyers have got where they have, brought moral wreckage to successive generations since the war, mainly because no one has opposed them. They have worked for the most part within a framework of permissive humanitarianism—largely created by themselves—where men have sought to deal with vice through legislation that made it socially respectable, thus giving to it a cumulative spread. This way standards—particularly those of the family—have loosened. To many materialists within the materialist culture of our day the work of the destroyers has appeared not as ultimately destructive, but as liberally enlightened; the pursuit of legitimate objectives by a broad-minded *avant garde*. Violence had not come in significantly at that stage; the whole thing was rather genteel; the ugly perversion had not begun. Now, however, all has changed. Violence has walked into its own. The destroyers are out of control; cringing, like so many of today's vice-chancellors, before student mobs. This world is no longer theirs, though it is of their making. It is one thing to deride goodness with smooth words over a glass of port in a university common room; but what do you do when those who have fed on your derision take it to its logical conclusion and bash you over the head? Babbling about "the rules of the game" under such circumstances will get you no more than a kick up the backside to complement the bash on the head. In the words of a discouraged don in the midst of a violent student strike at a provincial university:

"We have spent the last five or six years in this and other universities trying to find ways of governing by consent. I think that is now being proved impossible. Those who fundamentally reject our values may be a minority, but they are a sufficiently large one to bring us to a standstill when they want to".

Sharers in Chaos

The coming of violence has dismayed those who spawned it. I have no time at all for them, but I see hope in their

dismay. It could possibly bring them to their senses; take the guts out of their overweening pride and reduce them, happily, to silence, at least for the time being. Far better, it could serve as a signal for the great majority who reject violence not only to speak out against it, but to look at its causes and, in so doing, to see many amongst themselves as sharing at least to some degree in the chaos brought by the destroyers and, very specially, in the threat of violence that now hangs over our society like a great black cloud, threatening to bash and smash it in defiance of age-old democratic ways and the rule of law. I can think of many who have so shared.

There are the trendy clerics — Catholics as well as Protestant—who have used the language of violence, whilst disclaiming any intention of resorting to it themselves. These are hypocrites, however highly placed, for they must know perfectly well that to speak as some of them have done in this country against certain known abuses, can only incite to physical action in defiance of the rule of law; and that is shocking. It is bad enough to see men of God making fools of themselves through enmeshment in concrete issues of which they are often ignorant; it is worse when their words are taken as licence to smash and kill. Churchmen of this type need to be brought to heel by competent Ecclesiastical Authority. The current craze for ongoing revolution has got into their systems; talk of the need to counteract “the violence of oppressive social structures” is no more than an open invitation to their irresponsible following to use every opportunity to violate the rule of law in the pursuit of objectives, so arrogantly deemed legitimate because chosen by themselves. It is time these men got out of this second retarded adolescence of theirs and made their way back—on their knees—to the things of God.

Drifting Dons

Then, there are the dons, the university types of our day, whose sin is that of not actively opposing the destroy-

rs, the sophisticated godless men without a creed in too many university chairs—supreme egoists—who have made their business over the years to destroy in a myriad ways the values of those they teach, who have abandoned truth themselves and delight in stealing it from others so that, thereby, they themselves may be exalted. Their devilish work has been assisted by the refusal of so many who teach with them and who cannot bear the thought of being unpopular to take any firm stand against their corrosive words; the dead fish in senior common rooms, who drift with the tide against their real convictions because they are without the courage to swim against it. And the undergraduates, who have kept quiet out of human respect or a wish not to be involved, and left the leadership in student affairs to a violent fringe of wreckers, who have gone to the length in past years of violently attacking guest speakers in university precincts with whose opinions they disagreed, preventing them from having their legitimate say in ugly and barefaced defiance of the rule of law. Before this pirate crew in university after university, vice-chancellors have been cringing for the past ten years, in rather the same way that bishops and religious superiors have been cringing—even bowing and scraping at times, in disgusting fashion—before loud-mouted and ill-mannered junior priests and clerics whose only claim to notice is their mindless and mannerless vulgarity. Without the courage to assert their authority in face of the mannerless campus mob, which their colleagues in the educational world have so largely created, vice-chancellors not only here, but throughout the international university world, have spent their time sucking up to it. The spectacle is not merely ironic, but nauseating to a degree. Naturally enough, no results have been achieved through these spineless efforts to cuddle a monster, which can never be placated, but which can easily be brought to heel, if only the drifting dons of the academic world would have the courage for once in their lives to stand up and be counted; to say, without fear and in public, what in their hearts they really believe.

Good Men Must Stand

One could go on in this vein, but enough has been said. Right through the world of school and university, there is, at present a refusal of good men to stand, a cowardly tendency on their part to duck and seek smugness on their own, leaving the field to the advocates of violence and ongoing revolution. This has to stop. However one may shrink from it, the time now is for confrontation—eyeball to eyeball, if necessary; away from the peace of academic dreams and into the unpleasant weariness of unending battle. Action of this sort has to be taken at this stage, if violence is not to spill further onto the streets of our cities and anarchy take over in defiance of law. And not only in university common rooms and student unions, in staff rooms and teachers' associations; but right throughout the trade-union world the good men—and there are thousands and thousands of them—who have kept silent for so long, shaking their heads in secret over militant policies promoted by extremists, shamed by the violence and obscene vulgarity of some contemporary picketing, these good men must be quiet no longer. For them, too, it has to be eyeball to eyeball at branch meetings and on the factory floor; good men who are strong and unafraid standing up at last, speaking up and not letting the violent have their way.

Welfare State and Family

And what of the most basic society of all, the family? Here, the failure has been most complete; but it cannot be attributed to a direct and deliberate failure on the part of parents. It must be seen, rather, as the inevitable outcome of the well-meaning, yet mindlessly muddled humanitarianism that created the Welfare State (a very different thing from Welfare, of which I am wholly in favour). For, the effect of that social arrangement has been, as some of us declared at the time, to remove from parents ultimate responsibility for the material well-being of their children and

ad it instead onto the back of impersonal public authority. hereby, an almost mortal blow has been struck at family upbringing, which is built on and round the daily example furnished by the foresight and self-sacrifice of parents in giving care for their children. Once the need for so much of that care was removed through the imposition in its place of impersonal state provision, children no longer looked to parents, who appeared to them as no longer sacrificing themselves on their behalf; parents, in their turn, no longer felt responsible for their children as before, because responsibility had been taken from their shoulders by impersonal public authority. Thus it was that family ties were loosened, with children, at a far earlier age than before, moving into a kind of bogus equality with and, then, independence from their parents: another short step and they themselves were out of control because subject to the frustrations that come inevitably when adulthood is attempted before its time. Out of this confused mass of adolescents, to which all is increasingly permitted at school, the emergence of a violent and vicious and very nasty fringe comes as a matter of course—to be played on naturally by those who are in the sex game, the porn game, the pop game, the mod game and all the other games, merely for profit.

When Violence will Go

The surprising thing, really, is that, given all this, so much that is good has survived. What amazes me, indeed, and what I thank God for is that so many good people are still about; so many of all generations so ready to help, but feeling so helpless in face of the persistent and violent thrust of the destroyers and their often unwitting allies against everything we believe in at heart and hold most dear. We can be thankful, indeed, for survival, but survival is not enough. We have to pass beyond that point and work for a situation in which violence is off the streets and no longer spilling over onto them in defiance of the rule of law. This will only be the case *when violence is out of men's hearts*

and this, in turn, will be so only when the destroyers and those who cash in on their work of destruction are themselves destroyed; not violently, but, in this sense, that their destructive words and perverted views are listened to no longer by those who prefer instead to listen to the good men who openly stand against the immoral pace-setters of our day. This, I think, is the point. The essential work ahead is that of good men standing up everywhere and at all levels of social life, refusing to yield ground to the destroyers, determined to lose no opportunity of confronting them. In the Church, where the rot runs deep, and outside it, this is what we have to do; not by ourselves, but with the help of God. Figuratively speaking, the task of each can be simply put; it is to close with the enemy and destroy his twisted values. It belongs to each according to the measure of his ability. If each sets out to do it—to stand up and be counted, no matter how hard—we will be amazed at the impact made. The time has come to make it.

Just published — Highly recommended

ATHANASIUS
AND
THE CHURCH OF OUR TIME

By

Dr. Rudolf Graber, Bishop of Regensburg

Obtainable at 75p (post-free) from:

Miss M. G. C. Neilson,

6, Belford Park, Edinburgh EH4 3DP.

How do we defend "Humanae Vitae" against people who point to the populations of India and South America? Should there be a special liturgical language, and, if so, what form should it take? What is the place of bodily suffering in Christian life?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

How are we to answer people who point to the populations of India and South America as proof of the unreasonableness of "Humanae Vitae"?

How do we answer those who allege over-population in other parts of the world (including this country) as proof of the unreasonableness of condemning abortion on demand and voluntary (and even compulsory) sterilization? The usual response is an appeal to the natural law, as coming from God—the right of all innocent human beings to life, and the duty of all human beings to preserve, as far as they can, their physical integrity.

The appeal of "Humanae Vitae" is to natural law. The constitution and functions of human nature are such and such by creation. Human nature must honour the will of God implicit in the way it has been made. When the human race faces difficulties, real or imagined, of over-population and poverty, it must be clear about the principles on which any right solution must be based; and first among those principles are the ones embodied in the natural law.

That answer, as is clear from the uproar made by many Catholics on the publication of "Humanae Vitae", will be vigorously and contemptuously opposed. Solutions, to be accepted, must be easy and permissive. They must not demand self-control. On no account must they lower, or

threaten to lower, the material standard of living. As what is claimed to be natural law requires all kinds of unselfishness, it must be scrapped or at least be so interpreted that it allows human beings to do as they like.

The Church teaches, as she has always taught, that there is a natural law, and that she, and she alone, is the divinely appointed formulator and interpreter of the law when it needs formulation and interpretation. That is a claim which practising Catholics admit.

Do you think there should be a special liturgical language; and, if so, what form should it take?

Do *you* think there should be a special liturgical mind; and, if so, how should it express itself? The answer to your questions, it seems to me, is to be found in an understanding of language. Words ought to be true to the mind which chooses them, and suited to the one to whom they are addressed and to the circumstances in which they are uttered. They need to be meaningful sounds that honestly convey a speaker's grasp of truth and are part of a genuine personal relationship which necessarily includes a due esteem of the person addressed.

You can see the application of those principles to our worship of God. We begin with what will never end, an awe of God Who, even for those blessed with His immediate presence, "the beatific vision", is infinite, immeasurable, incomprehensible. We can know God, but never as He knows Himself; and in face of mystery we must be acutely conscious of our own flimsiness and transparency, and we should have the fear that is the beginning of wisdom. Revelation has taught us that God is infinite love; and wisdom, the gift of God, the Holy Spirit, brings us to an amazement of gratitude for God's love, and to an earnestness in endeavour to respond to it. When we speak to God, our words, to be true to our lives, must be humble and loving: "From the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks". What we say in worship is different in source and

a intensity from any other kind of utterance; and it is naturally different in form.

The language of the liturgy should be intelligible to those who worship in it; but it would fail in its purpose if it were in the current, down-to-earth idiom of ordinary speech.

What is the place of bodily suffering in Christian life? Are we worse or better off since the discovery of anaesthetics?

I like the story of the surgeon whose patient died after an operation. The surgeon commented, "True, he died; but he died cured".

The illness for which the medical profession has so far found no cure is the illness called "terminal": it is the one you die of. It must have its own peculiar suffering, which has never been described, but the fact of inevitable death does illuminate the painful path that leads to it. Death could be a final acceptance of God's Providence and the last gift of ourselves that we make to Him; and the same kind of assent and offering ought to be made, if we can bring ourselves to that generosity, on the occasion of any suffering of body or mind.

But it would be wrong to think that suffering is good in itself, so that we must want it, take it, and neither avoid nor diminish it. Our very nature is, in a sense, very selective about suffering. It welcomes a little of it—just enough to serve as a warning—and then rejects it. The body is so made that it repels intruders which are or may be damaging. If, at times, the body is unable to stem the invasion, man, whose body it is, may come to its aid—he has a duty to take care of himself. He can, by vaccination, train the body to ward off small-pox; and now he has a great variety of antibiotics to deal with a range of diseases. There is no moral problem that I can see in the prevention or alleviation of physical suffering. There is, however, a medical problem—how not to employ remedies which cause diseases and how

not to discourage nature from using the built-in defences.

I work with severely subnormal, multi-handicapped children. What answer can I give to visitors to my ward who say, "There can't be a God, or He would not allow such things to happen"?

You can't give an acceptable answer in a few well-formed sentences. It is just possible that, in the brief interchange allowed by the circumstances, you could set the enquirer thinking, so that he would come back not so sure of his reproach against God.

A genuine belief in God must accept the fact of God's infinite goodness. Where, then, does evil come from? Man himself must be the source of it, misusing the freedom which is God's greatest gift to him (without it he would not be a person but a mere animal) and which God will not take away from him. Even a superficial study of history shows man's inhumanity to man throughout the ages; but one need only consider the man-made evils within living memory, or observe what is happening before our eyes.

Unnumberable millions, many of them children, have been imprisoned, tortured and murdered under Communists and Nazis in Russia, Germany and China. Nearer home the ruthless greed of one drug company, marketing thalidomide in spite of urgent warnings that it was the cause of deformation of children if taken by pregnant women—(See, *Thalidomide and the Power of the Drug Companies*, by Sjoström and Nilsson, Penguin) — has brought untold suffering on hundreds of children and their parents. "In Britain 500 children die every year from injuries inflicted by their parents; suspect wounds lead medical authorities to suppose that perhaps 11,000 each year suffer some sort of attack." (*The Private Future*, by M. Pawley). The parents of those battered babies are, in general, adjudged to be mentally normal. The primary evil in our world is sin, and sin belongs not to God but wholly to man.

STATISTICS OF DECLINE

MASS ATTENDANCE

Westminster		Southwark + Arundel & Brighton	
Year	attendance	Year	attendance
1966	273,835	1952	159,249
1967	267,515	1953	164,162
1968	263,138	1954	168,852
1969	252,322	1956	185,968
1970	246,515	1957	203,287
1971	243,458	1958	209,094
1972	230,166	1959	216,970
		1960	227,578
		1965	237,522
		1973	226,527

Liverpool		Lancaster	
Year	attendance	Year	attendance
1963	267,251	1966	74,510
1969	227,520	1971	65,555

Catholic Education Council reported a drop in Mass attendance of 100,000 between 1968 and 1971. *Catholic Herald*; July 7, 1972.

The decline in Mass attendance in Britain is far less serious than in such countries as the U.S.A., Holland, and France where liturgical innovation has been far more radical.

CONVERSIONS, BAPTISMS and ORDINATIONS NATIONAL FIGURES

These figures are based on a survey conducted by Father Bryan Houghton who based them on the *Catholic Directory* and diocesan year books. The figures were published in the C.P.A. Newsletter; Vol. III; 1973. Figures for 1971 and 1972 have been added from the 1974 *Catholic Directory*.

Year	CONVERSIONS	BAPTISMS
1953	11,900	90,936
1957	14,581	107,125
1960	14,483	122,562
1963	12,128	136,350
1966	9,121	131,890
1968	7,344	120,704
1970	5,847	110,362
1972	5,141	95,813

Year	ORDINATIONS (Secular)	ORDINATIONS (Regular)
1953	?	?
1957	?	?
1960	139	76
1963	131	84
1966	111	81
1968	102	68
1970	85	?
1972	?	?